RECORD OF ORAL HEARING	
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMAR	K OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPI	EALS
AND INTERFERENCES	
<u>=</u>	
•	•
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	KA,
and KAZUHIKO TAKEMURA	
	
1 2007 0074	MAILED
**	1
* *	MAY 1 5 2007
Technology Center 3000	·
	PAT. & T.M. OFFICE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
Oral Hearing Held: April 24, 2007	AND INTERFERENCES
Of all Hearing Heid. April 21, 2007	
Before KENNETH W. HAIRSTON, HOWARD B. BLAN	NKENSHIP, and
MASHID D. SAADAT, Administrative Patent Judges.	·
ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS:	
JOHN R. SANDERS, PATENT AGENT	
Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP	
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747	
The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday	y, April 24, 2007,
commencing at 9:00 a.m., at The U.S. Patent and Tradema	ark Office, 600
Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Victoria Gude	eman, Notary
Public.	
	UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMAR BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPLAND INTERFERENCES Ex parte KAZUO SHIOTA, SHUICHI OHTS NOBUYOSHI NAKAJIMA, NORIHISA HA SUGIO MAKISHIMA, HIROSHI TANAI and KAZUHIKO TAKEMURA Appeal 2007-0974 Application 08/979,567 Technology Center 3600 Oral Hearing Held: April 24, 2007 Oral Hearing Held: April 24, 2007 Before KENNETH W. HAIRSTON, HOWARD B. BLAMMASHID D. SAADAT, Administrative Patent Judges. ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS: JOHN R. SANDERS, PATENT AGENT Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP P.O. Box 747 Falls Church, VA 22040-0747 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday commencing at 9:00 a.m., at The U.S. Patent and Tradema Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Victoria Gude

1	MR. SANDERS: Good morning, Your Honors. Let me just talk for a
2	few moments about the nature of the invention, and then go into the
3	rejection and the prior art that has been levied against the claims.
4	First, though, the appeal brief is directed to many different groups of
5	claims. However, all of them all the claim groups do contain the aspect of
6	the invention that I'm going to discuss today, so I'm going to keep it simple
7	and just direct it to the main feature.
8	If you would, think back to 1997. This is when this case was filed.
9	So it is directed to some technology that may seem commonplace nowadays,
10	digital cameras and or digital picture ordering. Back in '97, digital
11	cameras were more on the forefront, more expensive. What we're talking
12	about right now is film ordering, print ordering.
13	The present invention is directed to recording high-resolution picture
14	image data and let me back up. I'm sorry. Let me talk about the problem
15	to be solved in this case.
16	First of all, print ordering information in electronic data format is
17	what the prior art at the time of the invention was directed to. We have film
18	service industry where if you have a roll of film, you can get an index file
19	printed of those images after they have been scanned from the film, and
20	electronic ordering can be performed using that index print.
21	This ordering information for a client software, such as application
22	software on a client computer or user computer at home, this order
23	information dictating types of photo finishing to be processed on the image,
24	size of the image, number of prints to be ordered. And this order
25	information used by are used by the print services, such as a photo lab
26	development, print enlargement services. And these available printing

services tend to vary, depending upon the specific lab that the user is using or time of the year.

For example, at certain times of the year, a user might be able to order Christmas cards with images from the film that they have given to the print services. Other times, new services can be rolled out, old ones discontinued. So what we have right now is a roll of film given to a film service that then provides the customer with an index print of -- an index file of the scanned images from the film. And then using that information at a client's home computer, they can then pull up those prints and then order whatever they want.

So what happens with the prior art is that since these printing services can change over time, that the prior art did not recognize, well, if a person has gotten this disk or medium with the index print file on there, and then takes it home and then puts it on his computer and is using application software to order prints, that their application software may not have all the updated print services. That can change over time or be seasonal or whathave-you.

So the present invention -- and if you'll just look at Claim 1, it's a picture print ordering method which orders a print of a picture image by generating print ordering information comprising electronic data in a predetermined standard to be processed by a predetermined photo finishing system comprising the steps of recording high-resolution picture image data obtained by reading a developed film. That's recording that image data and the printing service information regarding the printing service which can be provided for the picture data, high-resolution picture data. That's recording high-resolution picture image data and printing service information both in

the same portable recording medium. 1 So we have the image data recorded from a photographic film. The 2 important thing to see here is the printing service information regarding the 3 4 printing service which can be provided, that also being in the same portable 5 recording medium. That printing service information is also delineated in the claim as 6 7 being updateable information for use in generating an updateable order 8 screen displaying available printing services from which a user selects. 9 Further claim limitations deal with displaying this order screen using the printing service information, the updateable information, and then 10 11 generating print order information, which is the actual order that the user is using for, you know, selecting size, a 4-by-6 print, wallet size. Also 12 specifying service provider at which the printing service information has 13 been recorded in the portable recording medium. 14 15 So I'll just go ahead and get to the rejection. And the main reference 16 is Moghadam. I don't know if I'm pronouncing that correctly. What I'm to point out here is that the 103 rejection, Moghadam in view of -- I'm not 17 today going to be arguing motivation. I'm not acquiescing to motivation. 18 The core argument in this case is whether or not the references even show all 19 20 the features of the claim. 21 So Moghadam is directed to network-based print ordering. It involves some of the similar technology. I will say that. What we have is 22 23 photographic film being sent to or delivered to a print ordering or printing facility, a print service provider. And some of the features of Moghadam 24 25 which are talked about by the examiner are directed to a magnetic strip

which is placed on the film recording information. Now, this may, on the

surface, appear to be information that's recorded on a portable medium. The 1 examiner points to the cartridge, the actual film cartridge, as being a portable 2 3 medium. However, this is actually on the film itself. One of the limitations of 4 5 the claim is that it's -- we're recording high-resolution picture image data obtained by reading a developed film, so we've read the data off the film. 6 7 But also more importantly is that the magnetic strip is for recording a 8 customer's address or information regarding the order itself, such as film characteristics of the original film, exposure conditions and the like. 9 10 Most importantly, this is not printing service information regarding 11 the printing service, which can be provided. This was part of, I believe, the final rejection of our earlier arguments. 12 13 Characterizing Moghadam, we talk about -- it's directed to a photo 14 finishing system where you can place orders. However -- and I believe it's 15 directed to Figure 4 -- we have a central computer, which is 48 there, at a 16 print service location. And after the print service location has received the film and has scanned the image data off of the film, the photos are stored in 17 18 the central computer. 19 Now, for ordering purposes, the user, through a home computer, which you can see over there on the right, or a customer-authorized site over 20 there, we have -- it accesses these photos through data link 72 and performs 21 ordering in this way. This is entirely different from having print service 22 information on the same medium, portable recording medium, as required by 23 the claims, on the same medium as this image information, the actual image 24 itself. This is clearly network-based system. Also, Moghadam, in column 5, 25 26 lines 39 through 46, discusses how the prints can actually be ordered. And if

1	I can just go to it real fast.
2	So for this communication channel 72, customer at a convenient time
3	accesses the data, the digital file available for viewing. Customer can utilize
4	the print screen capability of the home computer, generate a hard copy of the
5	digital index prints, in turn can mark with a pen to indicate the customer
6	selections, including size and quantity. There is no discussion the
7	customer can then fax the screen printout to the photo finisher.
8	So what Moghadam doesn't go into is whether or not these ordering
9	options are every updated, for one thing.
10	We can say that since they're operating through a network, whatever
11	it's going to be at the network 48, the central computer, is most likely going
12	to be what's currently available. What the instant invention is dealing with
13	is a system where you have an application on your home computer, and a
14	portable medium that it's not network-based. You drop your film off at a
15	film mart. They give you this index print file on a disk. Associated with
16	that disk is their current updateable print services. If you have a client
17	application at home, that information that is now with the images on the disk
18	can then give you an updated service list on your home computer.
19	Now, in the
20	JUDGE SAADAT: Excuse me, sir.
21	MR. SANDERS: Yes, please.
22	JUDGE SAADAT: You're suggesting that Moghadam has all the
23	services or information about the print service in the distributed system.
24	MR. SANDERS: It does not say it does appear I'm sorry. Can
25	you repeat that?
26	JUDGE SAADAT: The printing services that the reference provides,

1 like information about the quality, the print number, and all that, is that 2 considered printing service information the same way claim requires? 3 MR. SANDERS: The claim -- print service information at the bottom 4 of the claim includes the qualify of attributes, including size and kind, and 5 name of an apparatus and/or service provider. So I would say that it's 6 comparable. 7 JUDGE SAADAT: And it is available -- you're accessing a network 8 or a server. 9 MR. SANDERS: The reference doesn't really go into that. 10 Moghadam talks about viewing the digital index prints, using the print 11 screen to generate a copy of the prints. There is also Figure 5 of Moghadam 12 is what Moghadam discusses as the ordering system, or the ordering 13 information. This is over the network. 14 We have sizes, selection of individual sizes. This is in column 6 in 15 the first paragraph. Kind? I'm not really sure how much figure 5 shows besides ordering sizes of specific prints. There's no discussion of post-16 processing or the service provider itself. We have his address. 17 We can get back to that. If I could move on to maybe some more 18 19 distinguishable features. 20 JUDGE SAADAT: Sure. MR. SANDERS: Okay. Once again, though, things that might seem 21 22 commonplace now, we've got to think back in '97 where cameras don't even have digital cameras within -- I mean cell phones don't have digital cameras. 23 24 Most people don't have a digital camera. On line ordering of prints is being used from primarily film-based stuff. 25 26 But let me talk about what the examiner talks about in his examiner's

- 1 answer, and what issues that he felt Moghadam -- or what limitations he believed Moghadam was showing. Then the examiner's answer, we are 2 3 talking about a CD ROM that is disclosed by Moghadam. Moghadam at least contemplates the use of a CD ROM to transmit the digital image index 4 5 file. 6 And let me just say again that the primary feature of the claims is 7 putting the photo -- the printing service information regarding the printing 8 service which can be provided on the same medium as the high-resolution 9 picture image data. But also, that printing service information is updateable 10 information for use in generating an updateable order screen displaying 11 available printing services from which the user selects. 12 The examiner points to Figure 5 as showing updateable print service 13 information. There is no disclosure that this information is stored on this 14 disk, on the medium with the image data. He tends to say that it actually is -15 - if I can just take a look at the actual -- he doesn't even go into that. He's 16 more focused on whether or not the data is actually displayed to the user. 17 So what we have is Moghadam not disclosing that this updateable 18 service information is actually on the disk. And if we don't have that in the reference, at least in this rejection, he's relying on it to show that, and it's 19 20 not there. 21 He goes into detail about the actual order screen, and showing this in 22 Moghadam. I guess there's some discussion about how it's updateable 23 information.
- Even if this information -- print service information was stored on the data -- on the disk with the image, Moghadam actually doesn't discuss that. Nowhere in Moghadam does it discuss it being updateable information.

26

Nowhere does Moghadam discuss keeping the print services current, or that 1 they are in some way related to an updateable information system. Also, 2 perhaps size and kind are shown in Moghadam. All I really see there is size. 3 But it also requires at least the name of an apparatus or a service provider by 4 which the printing service information has been recorded. 5 And with the secondary reference, Farrose, the examiner has gone and 6 used that to show the order screen and just a layout of the order screen in a 7 comparable embodiment remote printing ordering. But there's still no 8 discussion about actually having an updateable print service information on 9 the disk itself. That's the key point that we should --10 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Your 20 minutes is about up. Can I get you to 11 12 sum up? Is that your whole argument? MR. SANDERS: Key point is Moghadam is directed to a network-13 based system. We're not talking about a portable recording medium. 14 Moghadam does not discuss with any particularity the actual print services 15 that are being offered, beyond size, and maybe a type or layout. It doesn't 16 discuss whether or not these things are updateable or not. 17 But the actual placement of this print services information on the disk 18 with the image data is what is enabling this invention to have a user 19 application that is going to reflect the most recent and updated available 20 print services such that, you know, a user cannot place an order for 21 something that's no longer available and create a problem that way, or the 22 23 user not be aware of all the print service options that are available to him. I think the focus is a little bit more on -- the rejection is more on --24

originally was on the order screen. And then at some point in the examiner's answer, the examiner introduced some further arguments regarding

Application 08/979,567

- 1 characterizations of Moghadam, which we frankly don't agree with,
- 2 especially with respect to the CD ROM. There's a CD ROM contemplated.
- 3 The only thing mentioned as being on the CD ROM is the print index file
- 4 itself.
- 5 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Any questions?
- 6 JUDGE SAADAT: We have no more.
- 7 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Thank you.

8

9 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)